

DO NOT ENTER.  
Jm

1/30/07  
oracle01.027

**PATENT**  
**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**  
(oracle01.027)

5    **Applicant:**                    Claborn, et al.                    **Paper No.:**  
  
      **Application No:**        10/656,525                    **Group Art Unit:** 2168  
  
      **Filed:**                    9/3/2003                    **Examiner:** Morrison, Jay A.  
10    **Title:** *Apparatus and methods for transferring database objects into and out of database systems*

15    Commissioner for Patents  
      Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**Response to a final Office action under 37 C.F.R. 1.116**

20    **Summary of the prosecution**

      In a first Office action in the above application mailed 4/7/2006, Examiner objected to the *Abstract* as being longer than 150 words, objected to claims 7,8, 36, 53, and 56 because of various informalities, rejected claims 16 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, rejected claims 1-57 under 35 U.S.C. 107 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter, rejected  
25    claims 1-15, 23-35, 39-43, and 50-55 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the Oracle 9i SQL reference documentation (henceforth "Oracle 9i SQL"), and rejected claims 16-22, 44-49, and 56-57 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as obvious over the combination of Oracle 9i SQL and U.S. Patent 6,032,159, Rivlin, *Apparatus and method for annotated bulk copying [of] files to a database*, issued 2/29/2000 (henceforth "Rivlin"). Applicants responded to the first Office  
30    action by amending their Abstract and claims 7, 8, 36, 53, and 56 to overcome the objections thereto, amending claims 16 and 27 to overcome the rejection of those claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, amending independent claims 1, 36, and 43 to better distinguish them from Oracle 9i SQL and thereby to overcome the rejections of claims 1-38 and 43-57 under either 35 U.S.C. 102 or 103, and traversing the rejections of claim 39-46 under 35 U.S.C. 103. Applicants further added  
35    new dependent claims 58-65.

      In a final Office action in the above application mailed 10/18/06, Examiner persisted in his rejection of claims 39-42 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Oracle 9i SQL and rejected the remaining claims under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious over the combination of